

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/084,381	02/28/2002	Michael Maker	7200	6267		
7.	590 01/15/2004	EXAM	EXAMINER			
SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP			MUSSER, B	MUSSER, BARBARA J		
3000 South Ead Arlington, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
3			1733	4		
			DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					A 9			
		Applio	cation No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/08	4,381	MAKER ET AL.				
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
	·		ra J. Musser	1733				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appears on	the cover sheet with t	he correspondence addre	ess			
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty to period for reply is specified above, the maximum set to reply within the set or extended period for repreply received by the Office later than three months ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. is of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In n imunication. (30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply ar ly will, by statute, cause the	o event, however, may a reply statutory minimum of thirty (30 nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABANI	be timely filed O) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this common DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on						
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
	on Papers							
10)□	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected.	e: a) accepted or ection to the drawing(g the correction is red	(s) be held in abeyance. quired if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR	• •			
	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
a)[* S 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a clair All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation see the attached detailed Office activation can be a specific reference was included a comparable of the foreign later than the comparable of the foreign later than the comparable of the foreign later than the comparable of the first services.	y documents have by documents have by documents have by of the priority documental Bureau (PCT) on for a list of the confor domestic priority and in the first senter anguage provisional for domestic priority	peen received. peen received in Apploance re	ication No eived in this National State eived. 19(e) (to a provisional ap n or in an Application Da received. 120 and/or 121 since a s	pplication) ta Sheet. pecific			
Attachmen	• •							
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) I			nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-15				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Minke et al.(DE 4324970A1).

DE 4324970A1, having a common inventor with the application, discloses a method of forming an embossing roller by etching a roller having a smooth plastic film surface with a laser which moves along the surface of the roller and is controlled such that it forms a desired pattern on the roller surface. A uniform layer of silicone rubber is then applied to the patterned surface and vulcanized. It is then removed from the roller, inverted, and bonded to a different roller to form an embossing roller. The laser is modulated in accordance corresponding electrical information obtained by scanning the original pattern.(English Abstract, Oral translation)

In the alternative, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the surface of the roller smooth before laser etching as this would require destruction of less material and to control the movement of the laser to be congruent with a pattern in its memory as this would allow cutting of a pattern in an automated way.

Regarding claims 2 and 5, since the reference shows the silicone rubber layer being removed from the patterned surface, one in the art would understand that the patterned surface is formed such that the rubber layer can be separated from it.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minke et al. as applied to claims 2 and 5 above, and further in view of Goto et al.(U.S. Patent 5,397,417)

The references cited above do not disclose the material forming the patterned surface is nitrile butadiene rubber but does disclose it is a plastic material. Goto et al. discloses cutting a design into a sheet of nitrile butadiene rubber using a laser.(Col. 4, II. 49-50; Col. 5, II. 49-51) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the material used to form the patterned layer

from any conventional type of material which can be cut by a laser such as nitrile butadiene rubber since Goto et al. discloses nitrile butadiene rubber can be cut by a laser and since it would have been obvious to use an elastomeric material to make it easier to remove the rubber layer from the patterned surface.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement filed 5/16/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

While the German examiner clearly cited and perhaps used the references, a determination of relevance could not be made as the German office action was still in German. It is suggested a translation of the office action be submitted if applicant desires the information contained therein and the patents used therein to be of record. Since DE3405985 and DE4441216 were discussed in applicant's specification, this is considered a sufficient statement of relevance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Barbara J. Musser** whose telephone number is **(571)**

Application/Control Number: 10/084,381 Page 5

Art Unit: 1733

272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571)-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

BJM

GROUP 1300